

# SERMON

ON THE

## NEBRASKA BILL,

BY

REV. CHARLES BEECHER,

PASTOR,

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY, NEWARK, N. J.

---

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY;

---

NEW-YORK:

OLIVER & BROTHER, PRINTERS, 89 NASSAU-STREET.

1854.

# SERMON ON THE NEBRASKA BILL.

---

LORD, who shall abide in thy tabernacle? who shall dwell in thy holy hill?

He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart.

He that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbour, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbour.

In whose eyes a vile person is contemned; but he honoureth them that fear the Lord. He that sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not.

He that putteth not out his money to usury, nor taketh reward against the innocent. He that doeth these things shall never be moved.

PSALM XV.

---

A GREAT crisis has arrived in the affairs of this nation, and of man.

A deed is being done, by the national *head* and *hand*, equal in importance to the Declaration of Independence.

It is well for us, then, as a Christian people, to know what we, by our Government, are doing.

It is well for us to bring that deed, of such unparalleled importance, into the light, that we may see its character and estimate its consequences.

And *into what light* shall we bring it?—Into the light of the philosophy and wisdom of this world?

It is written, “The world by wisdom knew not God.” And, “This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, but men loved darkness rather than light.” Not, then, to the light—to the twilight—of worldly wisdom should we bring this subject, but to the light of Heaven, where it shines in the sanctuary, from the Word of God.

Oh that the cloud might fill the temple, as of old, when the priests could not stand to minister by reason of its glory!

I propose, then, to consider,—

I. THE DEED.

II. ITS CHARACTER.

III. ITS CONSEQUENCES.

IV. OUR DUTY.

I. The Deed to be done is,—

*To establish slavery in a territory ten times as large as the State of New-York, lying in the heart of the United States, and occupying the garden portion of the continent.*

The territory of Nebraska Kansas is as large as all the free states, or as half the great valley of the Mississippi. It lies in a temperate climate. Its soil is fertile. And it is capable of sustaining a dense population. It is the very heart of the continent. It is destined to hold the central sceptre of power in the destinies of this country.

Now, the deed to be done is, to make this a slaveholding territory.

If it be said that the bill before Congress does not say so,—that it only erects a territorial government,—the answer is plain.

The bill explicitly repeals the prohibition of slavery, that has stood by solemn compact thirty years. And an amendment, stating that the people of the territory might, if they chose, prohibit slavery, was promptly voted down. And lest the liberty-loving Germans and other emigrants should go in there and vote against slavery, a clause was inserted in the bill, forbidding *aliens* to vote !

Now, any man can tell, when an edifice is building, whether it is meant for a house or a jail.

If you find cells, and grates, and shackles in the wall, and all the minutiae of coercive restraint, you say, This is a prison.

So, when we look at that territorial government now building, and find a thirty years' prohibition of slavery repealed,—foreigners forbidden to vote,—the power of the inhabitants to prohibit slavery voted out,—we are warranted in saying, This is not a house, it is a jail. Therefore, *the deed* to be done, as to its essence and marrow, stripped of sophistries and disguises, is, to establish the system of slavery in that whole immense territory.

## II. CHARACTER.

1. Suppose, now, slavery were an indifferent affair—neither right nor wrong ; only that by the three-fifths representation principle it conferred certain political advantages on the South. Suppose that thus it were for the political interest of the South to get more slave territory, and of the North to get more free territory.

Thirty years ago, then, the South and North entered into a solemn compact, proposed by the South, and carried by Southern votes, the North being reluctant, that while above a certain line, 36° 30', slavery should be "for ever *prohibited*," south of it it should be left to the states to decide, when they were ready to come in.

The North has stood to that compact, and the South have admitted state after state south of that line, with slavery constitutions.

Now, the vast territory North of the line is just ready to be settled and come in,—the compact is suddenly repudiated, and the South insists on carrying slave laws all over that immense domain.

The question is, Is this honest ? Is it honorable ? Is it the best illustration of that chivalry which has been the Southerner's boast ?

It is said, indeed, that it was an act of Congress only, and, like any other act of Congress, subject to reconsideration and repeal.

But does that alter the morality of the transaction? The universal Southern sentiment at the time was thus expressed by *Nile's Register*, a leading paper, published in Baltimore :—

*"It is true the compromise is supported only by the letter of the law, repealable by the authority which enacted it; but the circumstances of the case give to this law a MORAL FORCE equal to that of a positive provision of the Constitution; and we do not hazard anything by saying that the Constitution exists in its observance. Both parties have sacrificed much to conciliation. We wish to see the COMPACT kept in good faith, and we trust that a kind Providence will open the way to relieve us of an evil which every good citizen deprecates as the supreme curse of the country."*

This, then, is the first feature of the character of the deed to be done—wholly apart from the nature of slavery.

Unlike the man commended by the psalmist, "who sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not," the South swears to her own profit, and then changes. How can she "dwell in the tabernacle of the Lord, and abide in his holy hill"?

2. But there is a still greater breach of faith involved in this deed—one involving, not the honor of the South or of the North alone, but the plighted faith of the nation. The faith of treaties, the national faith, is to be broken. The whole Eastern side of this territory is held by Indians, removed there by the Government. They were removed, some of them, in violation of right in the first place. Even politicians protested, and prophesied "that it would be impossible to give them a permanent home," if we once moved them. Yet, forgetful of a God above us, we did it. And to salve the bleeding conscience of the nation, the following enactment was adopted :—

"SEC. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That in making of such exchange or exchanges, it shall and may be lawful for the President solemnly to assure the tribe or nation with which the exchange is made, that the United States will for ever secure and guarantee to them, and their heirs and successors, the country so exchanged with them; and, if they prefer it, the United States will cause a patent or grant to be made and executed to them for the same."

Those Indians have relied on this faith. They have taken root. They are civilized, many of them. They have farms, and schools, and churches, and missions, and a regular government.

Now, the *deed* that is to be done involves the breaking of this treaty with the poor Indians.

Mark with what honeyed phrase a senatorial politician mouths the matter: "I *fear* that it is not possible to preserve this Indian barrier." Why not? Because we want a Pacific Railroad, and because they are

in the way there. "If we must use the tyrant's plea of necessity, *I hope we shall treat them with tenderness.*"

Yes; put the plough under them carefully. Drive the ploughshare of ruin through their peaceful villages *tenderly*.

Be very gentle as you cut up, root and branch, those hopeless, helpless, homeless wanderers, and scatter them like the chaff of the summer threshing-floor.

Let the nation, if she *must use* the tyrant's plea, enact the tyrant *tenderly*. Let her put gloves of kid over the hand of iron,—a lamb-like fleece over the paw of the wild beast; and let her soft, velvet touch quite console the breaking heart of the red man, as he looks his last on his blackened hearth-stone and the graves of his fathers.

When Saul undertook to dispossess the Gibeonites of their inheritance, do you not recollect the sequel?

The Gibeonites were the aborigines. Although devoted to destruction, they escaped by stratagem. Israel made a treaty with them, when they conquered Canaan by Joshua. They held their lands by that treaty five hundred years. Saul undertook to dispossess them. He was cut off in battle before achieving his purpose. He had just done enough, however, to leave them open to the next unprincipled king that might reign. God sent the famine—a three years' famine. And when David inquired into the matter, how did it result? *Seventy men of Saul's house were hung up* before the Lord; and the Gibeonites were never troubled by any king after that.

But as the bloody house of Saul, in our time, are flourishing again, in full flower; and as we have no David to give them *their due*, in like manner; alas for our poor Gibeonites! they are gone, their patrimony devoured, they are consumed out of our coasts, they perish from off the face of the earth.

Here, however, it may be said that it is proposed to pass an Indian Homestead Bill,—that such a bill is even now before the House of Representatives,—and that it will prevent the removal of the Indians, and confer on them the privileges of citizenship.

Such a bill is indeed before the house—and what does it propose to do?

It proposes to purchase all the lands, not only of all Indians in Kansas Nebraska, but on all United States territory.

"The Choctaws and Chickasaws, Seminoles, Creeks, Cherokees, Senecas and Shawnees, Quapaws, Osages, Miamies, Piankeshaws and Weas, Peorias and Kaskaskias, Ottawas, Sacs and Foxes, Kansas, Pottawatomies, Wyandots, Delawares, Kickapoos, Sacs, Iowas, Half-breeds, Otoes and Omahas."

But, say you, if we *purchase* their lands, if they *choose* to sell them, where is the harm?

The harm is, that when this nation once determines to buy, the Indians will have to choose to sell; means will be used to make them choose. Bribes, corruptions, threats and a deluge of whiskey. The *forms* of a treaty will be gone through with; but it is perfectly well understood that if that bill pass, not a tribe will be suffered to refuse. If they should resist, means will be taken to provoke them to acts of violence; the military will be called in, and a new Seminole tragedy enacted, and they removed at the point of the bayonet.

But suppose they yield (since it is Hobson's choice) and sell out—"cede"—their territory.

Then what does this bill do?

I answer, it extinguishes their nationality at the outset. The Creeks, Cherokees and Choctaws are—thanks to Gospel missions—civilized and Christianized nations, with a regular constitutional government. Their name and their national existence perish the hour this bill goes into effect; for, says the bill,—

"All the lands within the boundaries of the tribe or nation making the treaty to be ceded to the United States, and that as soon thereafter as may be practicable, the President shall cause to be surveyed and divided in like manner as the public lands of the United States have heretofore been surveyed, and immediately thereafter each family of the tribe or nation shall be entitled to locate, as a permanent homestead—if a single person, over the age of twenty-one years one-eighth of a section; to each family of two, one quarter-section; to each family of three, and not exceeding five, one half-section; to each family of six, and not exceeding ten, one section; and to each family over ten, one additional quarter-section for every five members."

And the bill goes on afterwards to prescribe the details of the sales of the remaining lands, and of the payment of the proceeds,—by agents appointed by the President,—throwing the Indian families completely into the power of the President and his agents, as much as the office-holders are now; at the same time providing for their becoming naturalized as citizens of the United States. Thus their nationality is broken up, they are changed to voters, and their votes are at the command of the President, who has sole charge of the payments arising from sale of lands.

Here, then, is a notable scheme for buying for the administration the whole Indian vote. Moreover, lest that vote should happen to incline to the side of liberty—the Indian being possibly not yet sufficiently civilized and Christianized to appreciate the blessings of the peculiar institution—the following remarkable clause is inserted in the bill, to which I call your especial attention. After specifying that each family over ten shall have an additional quarter section for every five members, the bill goes on :—

"And to families who OWN SLAVES, in addition to the foregoing, there shall be allowed, if less than ten slaves, one half-section ; if ten, and not exceeding fifteen, one section ; and for every ten above that number, one half-section."

Then, the Indians are not only to be sold to the government as a Presidential body guard of voters, but a clear bonus of a section and a half of land for twenty-five slaves, and a half-section for every ten over that. Thus, the Indian that can contrive to get a gang of one hundred slaves would be rewarded with eight or nine sections of land.

It is a pity John Mitchel could not prove his mother an Indian,—there would be a chance for *him*.

Thus, by the bye, the slaves are to be given over to the irresponsible power—not now of christian masters, whether of the Legree or St. Clare stamp—but of the fiercest Indian savages, Sacs, Foxes, Kickapoos and Omahaws.

And *this* is the Indian Homestead Bill, which is to prevent the Indians being driven out by the Nebraska Bill. Let them be driven out a thousand times rather than this. Let them be driven into the Pacific, rather than sold to the slave power.

But is *this* the Nebraska Bill? some may ask. I answer, no but it is its twin brother. They came out of the same prolific Patriarchal womb, and when the Senatorial mid-wife was asked some questions about her Nebraska Jacob, she referred significantly to this Kickapoo Esau, in the House, as answering all questions.

Therefore, the character of the *deed* proposed to be done rises before us in unmistakeable colors. It involves a virtual violation of the national faith with the Indians. If not in the letter, at least in the spirit. The nation will be forsworn—the national honor lost. She removes her neighbors' landmark. She does evil to her neighbor. How shall she expect "never be moved"? How can she abide in the tabernacle of the Lord, or dwell in his holy hill?

3. It is time, however, to examine the intrinsic character of the deed, viz.: to establish, or permit to be established, the system of slave laws, where they do not now exist.

If I were arguing for immediate abolition of such laws where they do exist, I might excite prejudice in some,—I might fail to convince many estimable persons, however good my arguments.

But the question is not *abolition*, but INSTITUTION. Hence, I trust all old prejudices may be laid aside, all former issues forgot, and we address our minds to this single question,—Is the LAW of slavery so intrinsically right that this nation ought now to establish it—permit it to be established, where it has been prohibited for ever? Let us look at it calmly a moment. Is there anything in nature that ordains that the child of a slave-mother shall be a slave? Does not the Declaration say, "We hold

it to be self-evident that all men are born free?" But if so, how comes the child a slave? Does nature enslave him, or LAW—artificial law? *The law*, you answer. That child, that the Declaration says is born free—self-evidently so—THE LAW seizes, the moment it is born, stamps it with the seal of violence, and hangs the yoke of bondage on its neck.

As some Circean enchantress, THE LAW stands by the cradle of every infant of a slave-mother, and mutters a spell over its peaceful slumbers, and it is transformed to a beast. That immortal—redeemed by the blood of the Son of God—to whom angels minister—which must stand at the judgment seat of Christ—which must exist in joy or woe forever and ever—THE LAW meets on life's threshold and transforms to a chattel, like a lamb or a kid. Each rising generation of infants the law thus meets and disfranchises by a fresh spell of transforming power.

If God should mercifully ordain sudden sterility on all slave-mothers; if nature—shocked at co-operation in that so vast a deed of wrong—should shut the doors of the womb, and the whole issue of the house of bondage be in a moment cut off; and if then the law had power, as by enchantment, to seize in Africa an equal number of new-born infants; waft them by a spell through the air, and deposit them in the slave huts—that would be no more an act of enslaving nature's free-born children, than the law now performs on every generation. According to the Declaration, those infants born under the palm-trees of Africa are no more free-born than those born on the savannahs of the South. And the act of enslaving these differs not a shade, nor a shadow, from the act of enslaving those. Is the Legislature god to reach behind the veil and enslave generations of spirits yet unborn?

If, indeed, a legislature of men whose breath is in their nostrils could summon to their bar out of futurity's womb all spirits of a certain race that ever should be born, and brand them beforehand by Divine authority as chattels, like the beasts, *then* might they be born enslaved.

But till they can vindicate this prerogative of God Almighty, those spirits are born free. And the act of enslaving them is as positive an act of the law as if it snatched them by magic from the heart of Africa.

And what possible reason can be offered why the law should enslave that child? Because it first enslaved its mother when she was born? Because the law wronged the mother, therefore must it wrong her babe?

That babe's mother was wronged, when she was born, because her mother had been. Her mother because her's had been, and so on, up to the first piratical act of wrong on the coast of Africa. The law has done nothing but repeat that first act of wrong all along down the chain every time there was a babe born to repeat it on; and, therefore, it must keep on repeating it on all babes, as fast as they are born, for all time to come.



Can any one justify one link in the chain without justifying the first link on which the whole chain hangs ?

The only difference seems to be that the first act of seizure or purchase in Africa was done by an individual trader ; now it is done by a company. Then it was done by the law of individual will ; now by company rule and regulation. For a state is but a company, and state laws are only company rules. And slave states together are only a company of one hundred and fifty thousand capitalists, with a capital of two thousand millions of dollars, associated for the purpose, among other things, of enslaving three million, free born infants every generation. And slave laws are nothing but the company rules and regulations by which the business is carried on.

Now, does the form of doing the business alter its essential nature ? Does this business become right because it is an *old* business ?—because it is done by rule, methodically, systematically with the whole combined power of an immense company, which we call STATE ?

If I am enslaved *irregularly* by a single man, that is wrong ; if regularly by a company, that is right. If I am enslaved when grown to manhood in Africa, that is wrong ; but if I am enslaved from birth, that is right. If I am enslaved alone, and my mother escapes, that is wrong ; but if she also is enslaved before I was born, and I am enslaved because she was, that is right. Is this the logic of the nineteenth century of the Christian era ?

On the contrary, does not the law of God and the Gospel tell us, that if to enslave a woman be wrong, to enslave her child after her heightens the wrong ? If to do this individually and occasionally be wrong, to do it by company rule from generation to generation is increasingly wrong. The wrong increases. The debt to justice accumulates. The iniquity, instead of being extenuated, swells to a vaster aggregate, and darkens to a deeper dye of guilt.

Now, the question on which I solicit the unanimous verdict of this audience is,—are such laws *intrinsically* right, so that this Christian republic can, without sin, establish them over a vast empire—where they do not exist, but are prohibited ? If I undertook to make you say, they ought to be abolished immediately where they do exist, you would meet me with objections,—How can it be done ?—What will be the consequences ?—and all that.

But that is not the point.

Are these laws intrinsically right, so that we may, without sin, set them up all over Nebraska ?—that is the question. Nay, not only Nebraska, but all the territory of the United States—for that is the game ultimately. Nay, in all the free States, and all the world ; for what is right in Nebraska on one race, is right everywhere on all races.

Shall the United States, with the New Testament in one hand, saying, "Go, preach my Gospel to every creature"—with the other open Nebraska, and say to Anglo-Saxons, Choctaws, Sacs, Foxes and Kickapoos,—Organize yourselves into a vast joint-stock company for enslaving free-born infants of African race, for all ages to come—and institute laws transforming them to beasts of sale?

Shall this Christian nation say,—Go in there—plough out the Indians—abolish their nationality—break up their system of schools, missions, churches—sell them as an administration body-guard of voters—and set up *laws* that forbid the teaching of slaves to read—that prohibit the giving them the Bible, and abolish marriage?

This is the question. It is whether the nation shall build a peculiar institution, a dungeon-brothel, as large as all Nebraska Kansas.

And what is the character of that bill, then, that does the deed for us? What sort of a bill is that that sets up a law essentially wicked; inevitably cruel in its development; debasing master and slave; annihilating marriage; obliterating the family; breeding men like cattle; necessitating the lash; prohibiting letters; withholding the Bible; and that not in a corner, but in a territory large as the original thirteen, in the center of the continent on the throne of power of the republic, in violation of thirty years' solemn compact;—in violation of national treaty-faith; in the nineteenth century of the Christian era; in the midst of churches, and missions, and religious papers, tracts and bibles, and a vast machinery of world evangelization?

That does it while, at the same time, Russia, and France, and Turkey, and Algiers—nations anti-Christian or heathen—are abolishing those laws in their dominions?

Can the character of such a bill be over-stated? Is not language powerless to utter it,—incompetent to frame fitting expression of the judgments and feelings of the soul?

To say that the deed is wrong, does that satisfy the conscience?

Is there not a wrong here, which is properly unspeakable? Is there not a sin here whose scarlet can never become like snow,—whose crimson, gory-red, can never become like wool?

And if it seem so to us, who are of unclean lips,—if it so shock and appal filthy man, who drinketh in iniquity like water,—if its dark, atrocious, malignant, diabolical guilt makes us to shudder, whose righteousnesses are as filthy rags;—Oh, how must it appear to that Eternal One, who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity,—who cannot be deceived, will not be mocked, and before whose burning gaze all things are open and naked!

If he purged a world of violence by a flood,—overthrew Sodom by fire and brimstone,—plagued Egypt,—swept Babylon with the besom of destruction,—made Israel a proverb and by-word,—and shook the Roman

empire with earthquake after earthquake,—what cup of wrath will he commend to the lips of that nation which in the light of the latter day has transcended the combined iniquity and infamy of all?

### III. CONSEQUENCES.

It is time, then, to begin with trembling, to speak of the consequences to be anticipated, if this bill becomes a law.

When in Switzerland I stood upon the Righi, I saw beneath, in a valley, the spot where a mountain had fallen and overwhelmed a village. The peaceful inhabitants of the vale knew not, an hour before, of the impending danger; if they had, and had sent out surveyors to journey by the hour along the base and sides of that stupendous mountain, already tottering to its fall, *there* would be a faint emblem of our position as we walk along the base and side of this impending avalanche of ruin.

The consequences of its fall who can estimate?

1. The consequence first and most to be dreaded is the acquiescence of the nation. Are we ready to exclaim, "Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this thing?" Yet Hazael reigned. And this nation have acquiesced in deeds as bad as or worse than this.

In 1849, before I left the West, while the compromise measures of 1850 were concocting, I said, in a sermon on the subject, I could not believe that the nation could be brought to acquiesce in the Fugitive Slave Law. Even after its passage, when I first came East, I could not yet believe it possible. Too soon, however, I discovered my mistake.

Many eminent men differed widely from me in their views of that measure. In this community it presently appeared that they were a vast majority; their views prevailed throughout the country: the Law was acquiesced in.

Far be it from me to impeach the motives, or question the sincerity of any man, living or dead. Nevertheless, you will allow me to say, without offence, that if the views of the *minority* could have prevailed then, they would have saved us now.

The real ground of our danger now, lies in the principles which were established in 1850 by Daniel Webster, Moses Stuart, and others eminent in Church and State. They gave up that first principle of Protestant Christianity, the right of private judgment. They denied the first principle of religion, that God alone is Lord of the conscience, and that His law is higher than all human laws. Those sacred principles sustained a defeat at that time, from which I fear they cannot now rally. They were beaten down. They were trampled in the dust. Both great political parties vied in building platforms on their very grave. How can they have a resurrection? Public sentiment was demoralized. The church was debauched. The Union was then wrecked, not saved.

We have been in the trough of the sea ever since, and the waves that are tearing up our planks and sending us to the bottom, then first made clean breach over us. Therefore, I say, I fear the first consequence of the passage of this Nebraska Bill will be (after a few spasms) *acquiescence*.

This bill is not a whit wickeder than that of 1850, only its wickedness is more apparent. It has no constitutional fig-leaves to hide its shame. But if this be more naked, the public eye is more glazed. If this be more palpably and tangibly corrupt, the public heart is more hard, and its conscience seared.

The people are fickle ; the slave-power unchanging as fate. The people are undisciplined ; the slave-power is a solid phalanx of capital. The people are demoralized, immersed in Mammon ; the slave-power is aggressive, unscrupulous, and flushed with victorious ambition.

We shall have a few speeches, a few sermons, a few conventions perhaps, a great deal of bluster;—a calm will ensue; the thing will die away; the nation will acquiesce.

This is what *I fear*. It rests with you, and your fellow-citizens elsewhere, to show whether it shall be so. For,

2. The second consequence will be, provided the nation do acquiesce, the application of the principles of the bill to the whole North-West territory. The ordinance of 1787 will be like tow in the flame. The Indian Homestead Bill, now in the House, is a fire already lighted to burn it up.

3: The next consequence will be the final cession of the power of the Government into the hands of a small company of capitalists.

One hundred and fifty thousand masters, with a capital of two thousand millions, will own the Government in fee simple. They will always be able to command a working majority, against which it will be hopeless to contend.

4. The next consequence will be a decision that slave property may be taken into any State in the Union, and held there during a journey, or on a visit. And when that is done, the last step will be easy—the toleration of slavery, the establishment of slave law in every State in the Union, and the re-opening of the African slave trade.

5. Beyond that lies the acquisition of Cuba and Mexico, their conversion into slave states and the consummation of the ambitious projects of the slaveholding capitalists.

6. And beyond that lies—what? Beyond that—sooner or later—lies anarchy, civil war, and all the horrors of servile insurrection and massacre.

If these things do not come to pass, provided this Bill becomes a law, and is *acquiesced* in, then it will be because God sees fit for our express benefit to repeal the law of cause and effect, and to ordain that like

causes shall no longer produce like effects. But that which God would not do for Israel, his covenant people, he will not do for us, and the sum may be expressed in this. We shall be given over of God to judicial blindness. Christ will weep over us as he did over Jerusalem, saying, "If thou hadst known in this thy day the things that belong to thy peace, but now they are hid from thine eyes."

There is, therefore, a sublimity of iniquity about this deed coming to pass that defeats judgment. The evil is of such dimension that the common mind refuses to take it in—fails to appreciate it. The stupendous horror steals on upon the land like an eclipse, so gradually, so imperceptibly, as by the revolution of the spheres, that it seems but a natural twilight, or a natural night, in which bird and beast may retire to rest, and man lie down to repose till the morning.

But it is a night that knows no morning. It is an eclipse of the glory of God which will be total and final, and its midnight shadow will never pass off till it is forever dispelled by the fires of the Judgment Day.

#### IV.—DUTY.

Shall I go on, then, to speak of our duty?

1. As the indispensable prerequisite for doing anything well, let me warn and exhort you to put on humility like a garment. To deal with sin as we ought in others, we must well remember our own deep sinfulness. We must repent in sackcloth and ashes. We must be contrite and broken-hearted, and receive a strength from God through atoning blood; then we shall be able to fight the Christian warfare.

2. We must forecast what we will do if the Bill passes. *It will pass.* At any rate, suppose it. Suppose the worst. Then what? We must be ready, we must have our principles, and our determination fixed for a life struggle. We must say, *Slavery shall go down.* The South have broken all compacts. We will make no more. The South has thrown down the gauntlet, we will take it up. We will never acquiesce in this Bill. We will fight it step by step and inch by inch. We will *repeal* it, if possible. If not, we will call a National Council of Freedom, and adopt such a platform as the country never saw since the Revolution. It shall not be a Whig platform, nor a Democratic platform, nor of any other known political name. It shall be the platform of the principles of '76. The old spirit of the Revolution shall baptize us.

And we will put these planks in that platform :

1. No more slave territory, no more slave states.
2. Abolish the inter-state slave trade. We will have no more buying and selling men and women under our flag.
3. Amend the Constitution by striking out the clause for the rendition

of fugitives, and abolish all laws based thereon. We will have no more slave-hunting in *our* free States.

4. Deprive those one hundred and fifty thousand slaveholders, with their three million slaves of their three-fifths vote. Amend the Constitution. Change the basis of representation. Why should not the northern farmer have three votes for every five horses, or oxen, or hogs, as well as the southern planter three votes for every five slaves whom he buys and sells like cattle?

We will no longer put this rod of power into the hands of those capitalists for them to beat us with. We will no more, like Balaam's ass, cry, "Am I not thine ass, on which thou hast ridden since the day I was thine until now; wherefore smitest thou me?"

5. No more buying of Indian territory. The faith of treaties sacred.

6. And if the South choose to go out of the Union, let them try it.

Is the Union a god that we should fall down and worship it?

7. Slavery shall be shut up for ever in the States where it now exists. And they may abolish it or not, as they please. But when it comes to the State line, we say, Thus far shalt thou come, and no further.

8. The influence and power of the general Government, and its patronage, shall be thrown on the side of freedom, and against slavery.

Let this platform be adopted by a council of freemen. Let the churches adopt it. Let the press sustain it. Let the pulpit preach it. And let the people pledge to it their lives and sacred honor.

And let them vow before God never to cease fighting till that platform is carried.

*That* may save us. That alone, with God's blessing, *can*.

3. But there is a duty nearer at hand. This supposes the law to have passed. It has not passed. It *may* possibly be defeated. Our most immediate duty, then, is to unite in sending up a cry to Congress that shall make the majority there turn pale.

That majority is corrupt. That majority is unprincipled. From their splendid hotels, from their gorgeous banqueting halls and saloons, from conclave and caucus,—aye, and some of them from midnight orgies, and drunken revel, and blasphemous debauch in gambling house and brothel,—they gather together to insult the steadfast few "faithful found among the faithless," to defy Heaven and barter away the liberties of their country.

That majority, like an infamous herd of political blacklegs, gambling in election stock, sealing the fate of millions unborn,—the fate of the greatest empire sun ever shone on,—the fate of the world,—upon the cast of the presidential dice!

I will not say, Oh for a Cromwell, with his Iron-sides, to purge these halls at point of bayonet!—a Napoleon, even, to drive those beasts from

their stalls !—though even that were a blessed exchange. Ah no ! I ask for a PEOPLE, rising in their majesty and their strength.

All is at stake. All is lost, if they go on. And is there no check,—no rein on their neck,—no bridle in the hand of the people ?

The science of *lying* is so universally and perfectly developed,—falsehood brays in the ear of Congress, with such deafening din, its hundred-tongued rumor,—that the wretches in the majority there cannot hear, and will not hear, what the calm and orderly people at home are saying.

Alas ! nothing—unless it be a cry like the cry of Egypt at the death of her first-born—will arrest them,—unless the nation shriek, as men shrieked when the Deluge burst over them : it will be too late.

But if the voice of the nation, in its despair, in its repentance, in its wrath, rises—like the ocean, like the voice of God—and rolls in and dashes across the walls of Congress, then those minions will tremble ; then they will cower and crouch, and the *bill will die*, AND THE NATION WILL LIVE.